

CITY OF CHULA VISTA

**Growth Management Oversight  
Commission (GMOC)**

***2010 Annual Report***

Threshold Review Period 7/1/08 to 6/30/09

***April 1, 2010***

**Accepted by the Planning Commission (Resolution No. PCM 09-24) and  
City Council (Resolution No. 2010-\_\_\_\_) on April 1, 2010**

### **GMOC Members**

Carl Harry (Development)  
Armida Torres (Business)  
James Doud (Southwest)  
Steven Lizarraga (Education)  
Bryan Felber (Planning Commission Representative)  
Duane Bazzel (Environmental)  
Eric Sutton (Southeast)  
Russ Hall, Vice Chair (Center City)  
David W. Krogh, Chair (Sweetwater/Bonita)

### **City Staff**

Rosemarie Rice – Management Assistant  
Kimberly Vander Bie – Associate Planner/Growth Management Coordinator  
Marilyn Pongeggi – Principal Planner  
Ed Batchelder – Advance Planning Manager

City of Chula Vista  
Development Services Department  
276 Fourth Avenue  
Chula Vista, CA 91910  
(619) 691-5101  
<http://www.chulavistaca.gov/>

## GMOC Chair Cover Memo

DATE: April 1, 2010

TO: The Honorable Mayor and City Council  
Members of the Planning Commission  
City of Chula Vista

FROM: David W. Krogh, Chair  
Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)

SUBJECT: 2010 GMOC Annual Report (July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009, to the Current Time,  
and Five-Year Forecast)

---

The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) is pleased to submit its 2010 annual report for your consideration and action. We would like to thank the Planning Commission and City Council for their actions in November and December 2009, accepting the GMOC's recommendation that the GMOC perform a limited scope review this year, rather than none at all.

We feel that it would have been a loss if the original proposal, initiated by the City to skip doing an annual report this year, had been enacted. At our GMOC meeting on October 8, 2009 to consider that proposal, several members of the community, including two prior GMOC chairmen, expressed their disagreement, confirming the unanimous sentiment of our commission that there is value to consistent, annual monitoring and reporting of key standards, including review of follow-through on prior year GMOC recommendations. Some of the comments received included observations that improvements sometimes required repeated comment in successive years' reports, and that a hiatus of two years between reports might be fatal to the continuity that has led to past progress, such as improvements in Fire and Police, in recent years.

Although a limited scope review is unprecedented during my seven-year tenure on the GMOC, and, indeed, perhaps in the history of GMOC, in recognition of the current economic circumstances and financial challenges facing the City, the commission felt that identifying and focusing on a limited number of key areas was an appropriate and adequate balancing of benefit and cost considerations. In the future, we may also be willing to consider limited scope or whatever other reasonable measures may be necessary to sustain year-to-year continuity of review and reporting regarding key issues. Related to this, the GMOC has discussed with staff our willingness and desire for economy in performing the traffic studies for future review cycles.

The timing of this year's report and recommendations should allow it to be factored into City springtime budget deliberations. Upon completion of this report, the GMOC will continue working with City staff on top-to-bottom review, and we solicit Council's support toward that end during your upcoming budget considerations.

This year's report indicates that Libraries is non-compliant for the sixth successive year, and expresses our support of creative suggestions for remedying that failure via inexpensive expedient measures, even if "construction of a facility" may not become financially feasible until a number of years hence.

Police Priority II call response time is non-compliant for the twelfth year in a row; however, this year's report commends the Police Department for accomplishing significant improvements during the past two review cycles, and considers the possibility of modifying the threshold standard to focus on the most important Priority II calls.

Traffic performance, perhaps helped by current economic circumstances, demonstrated improvements during the year under review; however, it continued to fall short regarding one difficult key intersection. Engineering staff briefed the commission on the plans to bring that intersection into compliance in the upcoming year, and we urge City Manager and Council support of that continued effort.

To summarize, this year's limited scope GMOC review indicated that the City's performance was **out of compliance** with the following standards: **Libraries, Police--Priority II, and Traffic**. Performance against the **Fire and Emergency Services** threshold standard slipped slightly but remained **compliant**. In the **Fiscal** area, we expressed a **Statement of Concern**, which we hope that Council and staff will take under consideration during this year's budget deliberations and when dealing with development impact fee studies and adjustments during the upcoming year. The six **other areas not reviewed** this year were: **Parks and Recreation, Sewer, Drainage, Schools, Water, and Air Quality**.

Let me also take this opportunity to thank staff members and City department managers in all areas supporting our current year limited scope review, particularly our commission staff support member Kim Vander Bie, for their time and efforts, without which this year's report would not have been possible.

In conclusion, I share observations/commendations of current and prior city councils of Chula Vista for creation of GMOC and good management of growth over the years:

- The year I first joined the GMOC (2003), I noted that a university research study mentioned Chula Vista's GMOC as the reason for placing our city among ten top cities in America, illustrating good growth management policies.
- The City's traffic engineer reported at our February 4, 2010 meeting that in a January 2010 municipal planning conference in Berkeley, California, Chula Vista was spontaneously nominated from the floor by planners from other cities as an example of good, creative planning efforts.
- When Chula Vista's Western Traffic Development Impact Fee (DIF) was instituted approximately one year ago, it included support for regional transportation infrastructure, for example, the I-5 corridor study. The DIF was set at an amount above the minimum \$2,000 requirement under Transnet "Prop A," as determined by a fact-based analysis and calculation. These are examples of good public policy implementation by staff and council, and above average, in that respect, among San Diego County municipalities.

These demonstrate our City's dedication to quality planning and growth management.

# City of Chula Vista

## GROWTH MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (GMOC)

### 2010 Annual Report

---

## Table of Contents

<b>GMOC CHAIR COVER MEMO .....</b>	<b>3-4</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>REPORT PREFACE – QUALITY OF LIFE: A BROAD OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>7-8</b>
1.1 Threshold Standards .....	7
1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) .....	7
1.3 GMOC 2010 Annual Review Process .....	7-8
1.4 Growth Forecast .....	8
1.5 Report Organization .....	8
<b>2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS .....</b>	<b>10-20</b>
<b>3.1 Libraries .....</b>	<b>10-11</b>
3.1.1 Tactics for Bringing Libraries Closer to Conformance .....	10-11
3.1.2 Updating the Library Facilities Master Plan .....	11
<b>3.2 Police .....</b>	<b>12-15</b>
3.2.1 Priority I Threshold Standard Findings .....	12-13
3.2.2 Non-Compliance of Priority II Threshold Standard .....	14-15
<b>3.3 Traffic .....</b>	<b>16</b>
3.3.1 Non-Compliance of Threshold Standard .....	16
<b>3.4 Fiscal .....</b>	<b>17-18</b>
3.4.1 Prioritization of Projects Funded by Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF) Program .....	17-18
3.4.2 Statement of Concern .....	18
<b>3.5 Fire/Emergency Medical Services .....</b>	<b>19-20</b>
3.5.1 Threshold Standard Findings .....	19
3.5.2 Effects of Using San Diego Dispatch .....	20
<b>4.0 APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>20</b>
4.1 Appendix A – Growth Forecast	
4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires	

## Report Preface – Quality of Life: A Broad Overview

---

The Growth Management Oversight Commission's (GMOC's) principal task is to assess the impacts of growth on the community's quality of life, and to recommend corrective actions in areas where the City has the ability to act and/or can make a difference. This is an important and vital service. No other city in the region has an independent citizen body such as the GMOC to provide this kind of report card to an elected body.

The GMOC takes seriously its role of monitoring the impacts of growth and reporting to the City Council. The GMOC membership also believes that it has a responsibility to express concerns over issues that may not be part of the formal GMOC purview. For instance, maintenance and upkeep of necessary infrastructure for the City potentially impacts the quality of life for both current and future residents; increased costs of deferred maintenance could consume a significant amount of budget resources, thereby requiring cuts that may impact services, such as parks and libraries. Deferred maintenance could also result in degradation of facilities, leading to events such as broken water and sewer lines, ultimately interrupting services. The GMOC finds it important for this issue to be raised so that the City Council and the community have a full perspective regarding the City's quality of life. At the same time, the GMOC has tried to avoid duplication of effort, being mindful of the roles of other boards and commissions in taking the lead in addressing various types of issues, and to focus on its main priorities.

Despite the City's recent budget challenges, the GMOC believes the overall quality of life in Chula Vista remains good. However, it will be a test to maintain and improve the quality of life in the coming years as some of the City's limited resources will be needed to prevent degradation of City roads and facilities, and to construct needed new facilities, such as libraries and fire stations. The master-planned communities of eastern Chula Vista continue to be desirable and relatively affordable places to live as the real estate market begins to stabilize. The Otay Ranch Town Center is bringing in tax revenue and providing both residents and visitors from neighboring communities a pleasant venue for shopping, dining and entertainment. Initiatives for the Eastern Urban Center (EUC) were recently approved, and those for the University Park and Research Center continue to progress. Western Chula Vista continues to have many pleasant, stable neighborhoods, while redevelopment prospects there and at the Bayfront give rise to opportunities for physical improvements to be realized, as they have in the east.

The 2005 General Plan includes an updated Growth Management Element that provides a framework for continuing the evolution of the City's Growth Management Program. The Growth Management Ordinance, Policy and Program are being revised as part of a top-to-bottom review of the City's Growth Management Program. The revised documents are expected to move forward to City Council for adoption later in 2010.

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 The Threshold Standards**

In November 1987, the City Council adopted the original Threshold Standards Policy for Chula Vista, establishing quality of life indicators for eleven public facility and service topics. These include: Air Quality, Drainage, Fire and Emergency Services, Fiscal, Libraries, Parks & Recreation, Police, Schools, Sewer, Traffic and Water. The Policy addresses each topic in terms of a goal, objective(s), threshold standard(s), and implementation measures. Adherence to these citywide standards is intended to preserve and enhance both the environment and the quality of life of residents as growth occurs.

### **1.2 The Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC)**

To provide an independent, annual, citywide threshold standards compliance review, the Growth Management Oversight Commission (GMOC) was created. It is composed of nine members representing each of the City's four major geographic areas; a member of the Planning Commission; and a cross-section of interests, including education, environment, business, and development.

The GMOC's review is structured around three timeframes:

1. A fiscal year cycle -- to accommodate City Council review of GMOC recommendations that may have budget implications. This 2010 Annual Report focuses on fiscal year July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009;
2. The second half of 2009 and beginning of 2010 -- to identify and address pertinent issues identified during this timeframe, and to assure that the GMOC can and does respond to current events; and
3. A five-year forecast -- The period from January 2010 through December 2014 is assessed for potential threshold compliance concerns. This assures that the GMOC has a future orientation.

To gather a status of development impacts to the City, the GMOC distributes questionnaires to City departments and outside agencies that have the responsibility of reporting on their respective threshold standards. When the questionnaires are completed, the GMOC reviews them and deliberates issues of compliance. They also evaluate the appropriateness of the threshold standards, whether they should be amended, and whether any new threshold standard should be considered.

### **1.3 GMOC 2010 Annual Review Process**

In December 2009, the City Council approved an ordinance that would allow the 2010 annual report to focus on five of the eleven quality of life indicators. Therefore, this report analyzes the following topics: Fire, Fiscal, Libraries, Police and Traffic. The other six topics (Air Quality, Drainage, Parks & Recreation, Schools, Sewer and Water) are not included.

The GMOC held nine meetings between October 2009 and April 2010, which were open to the public. Representatives from Fiscal, Fire, Libraries, Police and Traffic gave presentations to the commission and discussed the questionnaires they completed at the GMOC's request. (As noted in Section 1.2, above, the GMOC solicits input through questionnaires distributed regarding quality of life indicators for public facility and service topics. The completed questionnaires are attached in Appendix B.) Through this process, city staff and the GMOC identified issues and conditions, and they are discussed in this report.

The final GMOC annual report is required to be transmitted through the Planning Commission to the City Council at a joint meeting, scheduled for April 1, 2010.

## 1.4 Growth Forecast

The Development Services Department annually prepares a Five-Year Growth Forecast. The 2009 Forecast was issued December 15, 2009. It provides departments and outside agencies with an estimate of the maximum amount of residential growth anticipated over the next five years. Copies of the Forecast were distributed with the GMOC questionnaires to help the five departments associated with the focused review determine if their respective public facilities/services would be able to accommodate the forecasted growth. The Growth Forecast from November 2009 through December 2014 indicated an additional 6,507 residential units could be permitted for construction in the City over the next five years, (6,256 in the east and 251 units in the west), for an annual average of 1,251 in the east and 50 units in the west, averaging 1,301 housing units permitted per year on average, citywide.

The projected units permitted per year on average, citywide, is down 256 units from last year's forecast of 1,557 units.

## 1.5 Report Organization

The 2010 GMOC Annual Report is organized into four sections:

**Section 1:** Introduction; description of GMOC's role and review process; an explanation of the Residential Growth Forecast; and an outline of the 2010 report

**Section 2:** A threshold compliance summary in table format

**Section 3:** A threshold by threshold discussion of issues, acknowledgments, statements of concern (if any), and recommendations

**Section 4:** Appendices



## 2.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

The following table indicates a summary of the GMOC's conclusions regarding threshold standards for the 2010 annual review cycle. Two thresholds were met and three were not.

<b>2010 THRESHOLD STANDARD – ANNUAL REVIEW SUMMARY</b> REVIEW PERIOD 7/1/08 THROUGH 6/30/09				
<b>Threshold</b>	<b>Threshold Met</b>	<b>Threshold Not Met</b>	<b>Potential of Future Non-compliance</b>	<b>Adopt/Fund Tactics to Achieve Compliance</b>
1. Fire/EMS	X			
2. Fiscal	X		X	
3. Libraries		X	X	X
4. Police				
Priority I	X			
Priority II		X	X	X
5. Traffic		X	X	X

## 3.0 THRESHOLD COMPLIANCE DISCUSSIONS

### 3.1 LIBRARIES

#### Threshold Standard:

The City shall construct 60,000 gross square feet (GSF) of additional library space, over the June 30, 2000 GSF total, in the area east of Interstate 805 by build-out. The construction of said facilities shall be phased such that the City will not fall below the citywide ratio of 500 GSF per 1,000 population. Library facilities are to be adequately equipped and staffed.

**Threshold Finding:** Non-Compliance

#### 3.1.1 Tactics for Bringing Libraries Closer to Conformance

LIBRARIES				
	Population	Total Gross Square Footage of Library Facilities	Gross Square Feet of Library Facilities Per 1000 Population	Need for Compliance
Threshold	X	X	500 Sq. Ft.	
5-Year Projection (2014)	249,654	102,000	409	*
12-Month Projection (12/31/10)	237,537	102,000	430	*
FY 2008-09	233,108	102,000	437	-13%
FY 2007-08	231,305	102,000	441	-12%
FY 2006-07	227,723	102,000	448	-10%
FY 2005-06	223,423	102,000	457	-9%
FY 2004-05	220,000	102,000	464	-7%
FY 2003-04	211,800	102,000	482	-4%
FY 2002-03	203,000	102,000	502	Compliant
FY 2001-02	195,000	102,000	523	Compliant
FY 2000-01	187,444	102,000	544	Compliant
FY 1999-00	178,645	102,000	571	Compliant

\*See "Recommendation" below

**Issue:** The Libraries threshold standard is out of compliance for the sixth year in a row, and the City Council has not formally adopted and funded tactics to bring the library system into conformance.

**Discussion:** Based on the threshold standard to “construct” 500 gross square feet per 1,000 population, the City currently has a deficit of approximately 15,000 square feet. The Libraries Threshold Standard Implementation Measure requires that the City Council “formally adopt and fund tactics to bring the library system into conformance, and that construction, or another actual solution, shall be scheduled to commence within three years of the threshold not being satisfied” (which was June 2007).

Since current estimates from the Finance Department indicate that “construction” of a new library would not commence until at least 2015, the Library Director should propose “another actual solution” to the City Council that would bring the library system closer to conformance sooner than 2015. Potential solutions, which the Library Director mentioned to the GMOC, might include delivering library services by leasing storefront property, utilizing a bookmobile, and identifying private grants solicitation.

**Recommendation:** That the City Council formally identify and adopt funding for an interim and/or permanent solution, based on recommendations from the Library Director, to bring the library system closer to conformance before 2012.

### 3.1.2                      **Updating the Library Facilities Master Plan**

**Issue:** The 1998 Library Facilities Master Plan should be updated to address changing trends, and to account for updated data in the City’s General Plan Update (December 2005).

**Discussion:** When updating the Library Facilities Master Plan, consideration should be given to changing trends to define adequacy of library facilities and equipment, and what constitutes adequate staffing and hours of operation. Libraries are no longer book depositories; they provide a variety of other services, such as computer usage, that can be provided in smaller spaces.

Once an updated baseline is established, the Master Plan would recommend how to most effectively and efficiently achieve the desired results, both in relation to new facilities and in regards to updating existing facilities. In addition, the updated Master Plan should reflect increased library needs generated by projected build-out population from the 2005 General Plan Update.

**Recommendation:** That the Library Facilities Master Plan:

- 1) Consider changing trends to define adequacy of library facilities, equipment, adequate staffing and hours of operation; and
- 2) Assess ultimate future library needs based upon the increased population from the City’s updated General Plan.

### 3.2. POLICE

#### Threshold Standard:

**Priority I - Emergency Response:** Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 81% of the Priority I emergency calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority I calls of five minutes and thirty seconds (5.5 minutes) or less (measured annually).

**Priority II - Urgent Response:** Properly equipped and staffed police units shall respond to 57% of the Priority II urgent calls throughout the City within seven (7) minutes and shall maintain an average response time to all Priority II calls of seven minutes and thirty seconds (7.5 minutes) or less (measured annually).

#### Threshold Finding:

Priority I: Compliance  
Priority II: Non-Compliance

Threshold Standard	Percent	Time	AverageTime
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	81.0%	7 minutes	5:30 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	57.0%	7 minutes	7:30 min./sec.
<b>Actual</b>			
Emergency Response (Priority 1)	84.6%	7 minutes	4:26 min./sec.
Urgent Response (Priority 2)	53.5%	7 minutes	9:16 min./sec.

---

### 3.2.1 Priority I Threshold Standard Findings

PRIORITY I CFS – Emergency Response, Calls For Service			
	Call Volume	% of Call Response w/in 7 Minutes	Average Response Time
<b>Threshold</b>		<b>81.0%</b>	<b>5:30</b>
<b>FY 2008-09</b>	<b>788 of 70,051</b>	<b>84.6%</b>	<b>4:26</b>
<b>FY 2007-08</b>	<b>1,006 of 74,192</b>	<b>87.9%</b>	<b>4:19</b>
<b>FY 2006-07</b>	<b>976 of 74,277</b>	<b>84.5%</b>	<b>4:59</b>
<b>FY 2005-06</b>	<b>1,068 of 73,075</b>	<b>82.3%</b>	<b>4:51</b>
<b>FY 2004-05</b>	<b>1,289 of 74,106</b>	<b>80.0%</b>	<b>5:11</b>
<b>FY 2003-04</b>	<b>1,322 of 71,000</b>	<b>82.1%</b>	<b>4:52</b>
<b>FY 2002-03</b>	<b>1,424 of 71,268</b>	<b>80.8%</b>	<b>4:55</b>
<b>FY 2001-02<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>1,539 of 71,859</b>	<b>80.0%</b>	<b>5:07</b>
<b>FY 2000-01</b>	<b>1,734 of 73,977</b>	<b>79.7%</b>	<b>5:13</b>
<b>FY 1999-00</b>	<b>1,750 of 76,738</b>	<b>75.9%</b>	<b>5:21</b>
<b>CY 1999<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>1,890 of 74,405</b>	<b>70.9%</b>	<b>5:50</b>
<b>FY 1997-98</b>	<b>1,512 of 69,196</b>	<b>74.8%</b>	<b>5:47</b>
<b>FY 1996-97</b>	<b>1,968 of 69,904</b>	<b>83.8%</b>	<b>4:52</b>

Note: Response times do not include dispatch time.

**Issue:** None

**Discussion:** During the period under review, the Police Department responded to 84.6% of Priority I Emergency Response calls within 7 minutes, dropping 3.3% after a 3% improvement the previous year. However, the percentage still met the threshold of responding to 81% of the calls within 7 minutes.

At 4 minutes and 26 seconds, the response time was 7 seconds off from last year's mark of 4 minutes 19 seconds. Yet, it was securely within the threshold of 5 minutes 30 seconds.

**Recommendation:** None

<sup>1</sup> All figures after FY 2000-2001 (as well as Priority II figures on the next page) reflect a change in citizen-initiated call reporting criteria. Prior to FY 01-02, citizen-initiated calls were determined according to call type; they are now determined according to received source.

<sup>2</sup> The FY98-99 GMOC report used calendar 1999 data due to the implementation of the new CAD system in mid-1998.

### 3.2.2 Non-Compliance of Priority II Threshold Standard

PRIORITY II CFS – Urgent Response, Calls for Service			
	Call Volume	% of Call Response w/in 7 Minutes	Average Response Time*
<b>Threshold</b>		<b>57.0%</b>	<b>7:30</b>
FY 2008-09	22,686 of 70,051	53.5%	9:16
FY 2007-08	23,955 of 74,192	53.1%	9:18
FY 2006-07	24,407 of 74,277	43.3%	11:18
FY 2005-06	24,876 of 73,075	40.0%	12:33
FY 2004-05	24,923 of 74,106	40.5%	11:40
FY 2003-04	24,741 of 71,000	48.4%	9:50
FY 2002-03	22,871 of 71,268	50.2%	9:24
FY 2001-02	22,199 of 71,859	45.6%	10:04
FY 2000-01	25,234 of 73,977	47.9%	9:38
FY 1999-00	23,898 of 76,738	46.4%	9:37
CY 1999	20,405 of 74,405	45.8%	9:35
FY 1997-98	22,342 of 69,196	52.9%	8:13
FY 1996-97	22,140 of 69,904	62.2%	6:50
FY 1995-96	21,743 of 71,197	64.5%	6:38

Note: Response times do not include dispatch time.

\* These figures do not include responses to false alarms beginning in FY 2002-03.

**Issue:** The threshold standard for Priority II - Urgent Response calls has not been met for the twelfth consecutive year.

**Discussion:** The percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes was 3.5% below the threshold standard of 57%; and the average response time of 9 minutes 16 seconds was 1 minute 44 seconds over the 7-minute threshold. However, the numbers have improved for the third year in a row, and the GMOC would like to commend the Police Department for significant improvements. Due to better education and communication within the Police Department regarding the GMOC threshold standards, as well as utilization of technological advances, the Department has improved the percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes by another .4% from last year, and improved average response time by another two seconds. Thus, in the past three years, the percentage of calls improved 13.5%, and the average response time improved by three minutes and seventeen seconds.

In reviewing the history of the Priority II threshold standard being out of compliance for twelve consecutive years, the GMOC believes it may be appropriate to modify the Priority II threshold during the top-to-bottom review. This would be the second modification since its inception in 1991.

In 1991, the Priority II threshold standard was: Respond to 62% of calls within 7 minutes, maintaining an average of 7 minutes or less. In 1999, the City's Special Projects Division and the Police Department presented the GMOC with a report titled "Report on Police Threshold Performance 1990-1999," which investigated response times and police threshold performance based on analysis of CAD system data. The report indicated that, prior to implementation of the CAD system, human error occurred when measuring dispatch time. It also indicated that the Priority II threshold should have been set at 57% of calls within 7 minutes, with an average response time of 7.5 minutes. City Council approved the proposed change to the threshold standard in 2002, which is the standard currently in effect.

As a result of a 1999 police threshold performance report, the methodology for reporting the threshold data changed in 2003. The report pointed out that 42% of the Priority II calls were alarm calls, and 99.9% of the alarm calls were false alarms. Thus, false alarms were taken out of the calculations. The Priority II threshold standard still could not be met, however.

The Police Department believes that, "With appropriate staffing levels...the current Priority II goals could be met." Currently, Chula Vista's staffing, per capita, is the lowest of nine city police departments in San Diego County. And with the current economic situation, increased staffing levels are not likely in the near future.

**Recommendation:** Modification of the Priority II threshold standard, which has been noncompliant for twelve consecutive years, may be appropriate, and should be considered during the top-to-bottom review, focusing on the most important Priority II calls.

### 3.3 TRAFFIC

#### **Threshold Standard:**

*Citywide:* Maintain Level of Service (LOS) "C" or better as measured by observed average travel speed on all signalized arterial segments, except that during peak hours a LOS "D" can occur for no more than two hours of the day.

*West of I-805:* Those signalized arterial segments that do not meet the standard above, may continue to operate at their current (year 1991) LOS, but shall not worsen.

**Threshold Finding:** Non-Compliance

---

### 3.3.1 Non-Compliance of Threshold Standard

**Issue:** There was one non-compliant arterial segment during the period (2009) under review.

**Discussion:** Compared to the previous year (2008), there was significant improvement during the most recent review cycle, with only one arterial segment failing to meet the threshold standard. In 2008, there were three arterial segments that failed.

In 2009, the one failing segment, northbound Heritage Road between Olympic Parkway and Telegraph Canyon Road, did not meet the threshold standard, due to excessive vehicular delay at the Heritage Road/Telegraph Canyon Road signaled intersection. While it has been out of compliance for the past several years, signal timing changes have provided gradual improvement and increases in average travel speed. However, after a signal change in August 2009, there were still more than two hours of LOS D in the northbound direction.

SEGMENT (Limits)	DIR	LOS 2008 (Hours)	LOS 2009 (Hours)	CHANGE
<b>Heritage Road</b> (Telegraph Canyon Road -- Olympic Parkway)	NB	C(1) D(4) E(1)	D(5) E(1)	-1C, +1D

Due to its proximity to Casillas Elementary School and Rancho del Rey Middle School, a heavy volume of pedestrian traffic at Telegraph Canyon Road significantly impacts this arterial and the traffic signal timing. Field investigations have shown that most pedestrians cross Telegraph Canyon Road on the east side of Heritage Road, rather than the west side, which takes longer to cross, due to an extra lane (an eastbound right turn lane). Since the traffic signal timing must allow for pedestrian crossing time, the extra length of the infrequently used west side of the intersection negatively impacts the ability to make further traffic signal timing changes. Therefore, later this year, the City will remove the crosswalk on the west side of Telegraph Canyon Road, with a current Capital Improvement Project. This will improve traffic flow, and, potentially, bring this arterial into compliance.

In addition, SANDAG is moving forward with the South Bay Bus Rapid Transit in this area, and planned improvements recommended for the Heritage Road/Telegraph Canyon Road intersection should have a positive effect on the northbound Heritage Road arterial.

**Recommendation:** Implement recommended compliance solutions, including eliminating the crosswalk on the west side of Telegraph Canyon Road and improving the Heritage Road/Telegraph Canyon Road intersection, as needed.



### 3.4 FISCAL

#### Threshold Standards:

1. The GMOC shall be provided with an annual fiscal impact report which provides an evaluation of the impacts of growth on the City, both in terms of operations and capital improvements. This report should evaluate actual growth over the previous 12-month period, as well as projected growth over the next 12- to 18-month period, and 5-year period.
2. The GMOC shall be provided with an annual Development Impact Fee (DIF) Report, which provides an analysis of development impact fees collected and expended over the previous 12-month period.

#### Threshold Finding: In Compliance

---

#### 3.4.1 **Prioritization of Projects Funded By Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF) Program**

**Issue:** Despite GMOC's recommendation in last year's annual report, prioritization of funding for facilities that are slated for construction within the Public Facilities Development Impact Fees (PFDIF) program has not been officially adopted by City Council.

**Discussion:** At the Joint Workshop with GMOC, Planning Commission and City Council on June 5, 2008, the following suggestion was made in regards to ensuring adequate funding for all facility projects slated for construction: *Implement a policy on the construction of facilities. Include language for dealing with priorities, how facilities would be funded, how they would be reported, and impacts of the expenditures.*

In response to this, the GMOC, in its 2009 Annual Report, discussed this issue and made the following recommendation: *That City Council direct the City Manager to develop a facility prioritization policy that includes an explanation for how priorities are determined, how facilities would be funded, how they will be reported, and impacts of the expenditures. This policy should be used as a basis for all decisions by the City Council on any PFDIF funding proposals.*

Despite this, the Finance Department reports that a prioritization program for PFDIF-funded projects has not been developed. They had expected to develop it by December 2009 in conjunction with the next comprehensive update of the Public Facilities Development Impact Fee (PFDIF) program. However, the PFDIF update has been postponed until December 2010.

The Finance Department also reports that there are currently five major facilities planned for construction using PFDIF funds, which are listed in order of construction priority, below:

1. Rancho del Rey Library
2. Eastern Urban Center Fire Station
3. Eastern Urban Center Library
- 4./5. Otay Ranch Village 4 Aquatics Center & Recreation Facility.

The Finance Department notes that City Council has not officially adopted the prioritization listed above.

**Recommendation:** That City Council direct the City Manager to develop a PFDIF facility prioritization policy by December 2010, which includes an explanation for how priorities are determined, how facilities would be funded, how they will be reported, and impacts of the expenditures. The policy should be brought back to City Council for adoption, and the list should be used as a basis for all decisions by the City Council on any PFDIF funding proposals.

### 3.4.2 Statement of Concern

As discussed in previous GMOC annual reports, slower growth has compromised the City's ability to timely deliver public facilities funded through Public Facility Development Impact Fees (PFDIFs), affecting the City's ability to comply with certain threshold standards, such as Libraries. Now, there appears to be another possible threat to timely construction of public facilities: longer and, therefore, higher debt service payments, which may necessitate increases in DIF amounts.

According to the City's Finance Department, the last comprehensive PFDIF assessment occurred in November 2006, and a re-assessment is planned for later this year. Although it is premature to speculate on the amount of any PFDIF increase at this time, the GMOC looks forward to learning the results of the updated PFDIF calculations so that we can reconsider the following concerns during GMOC's next review cycle:

- 1) Impact on the schedule of planned capital expenditures;
- 2) Amount of future DIF increase, if any, due to increased debt carrying costs; and
- 3) Impact of future DIF increase, if any, on future residents.

In addition, the GMOC became aware of the potential for establishing a PFDIF "reserve fund," and is concerned about the potential impact this would have on the schedule of planned capital expenditures necessary to achieve compliance with threshold standards.

## 3.5 FIRE / EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

### Threshold Standard:

Emergency response: Properly equipped and staffed fire and medical units shall respond to calls throughout the city within seven (7) minutes in 80% (current service to be verified) of the cases (measured annually).

**Threshold Finding:** In Compliance

### 3.5.1 Threshold Standard Findings

FIRE/EMS - Emergency Response Times			COMPARISON	
Review Period	Call Volume	% of All Call Response w/in 7:00 Minutes	Actual Response Time for 80% of Calls	Average Travel Time
<b>THRESHOLD</b>		<b>80%</b>		
FY 2009	9,363	84.0%	4:46	3:01
FY 2008	9,883	86.9%	6:31	3:17
FY 2007	10,020	88.1%	6:24	3:30
CY 2006	10,390	85.2%	6:43	3:36
CY 2005	9907	81.6%	7:05	3:31
FY 2003-04	8420	72.9%	7:38	3:32
FY 2002-03	8088	75.5%	7:35	3:43
FY 2001-02	7626	69.7%	7:53	3:39
FY 2000-01	7128	80.8%	7:02	3:18
FY 1999-00	6654	79.7%		3:29

Note: Reporting period for FY 2001-02 and 2002-03 is for October 1, 2002 to September 30, 2003. The difference in 2004 performance when compared to 2003 is within the 2.5% range of expected yearly variation and not statistically significant.

**Issue:** None

**Discussion:** Responding to 84% of calls within seven minutes, the Fire Department firmly met the threshold standard of responding to 80% of calls within seven minutes. Yet, this was 2.9% worse than last year's percentage of 86.9%, and there were 520 less calls received from the previous year.

The actual response time for 80% of the calls dramatically improved from last year, going from 6 minutes 31 seconds to 4 minutes 46 seconds. The average travel time also improved from 3 minutes 17 seconds to 3 minutes 1 second.

Of all calls received, 2% were for fire, 87.5% were for medical, and 10% were for other emergencies.

**Recommendation:** None

### 3.5.2 Effects of Using San Diego Dispatch

**Issue:** Since outsourcing Chula Vista's emergency dispatch system to San Diego, response times have been on a downward trend.

**Discussion:** Since March 2008, Chula Vista has had a contract with San Diego Dispatch to respond to fire and medical dispatch calls. During the approximately 16 months since that arrangement was made, dispatch and travel times, as well as percentage of calls within 7 minutes, got worse.

As the table below indicates, the average response and dispatch times between July 1, 2008 and June 30, 2009 were slightly better than between March and June 2008. The response time went from 5:29 to 5:23, and the dispatch time went from 35 to 32 seconds. The percentage of calls responded to within 7 minutes got slightly better, going from 82.2% to 84%. Yet, these numbers are considerably longer than before Chula Vista teamed up with San Diego Dispatch.

The average response time is 25 seconds longer; average dispatch time is 21 seconds longer; average travel time is 14 seconds longer; and the percentage of calls within 7 minutes is 3.4% less.

Comparative Data Before and After Using San Diego Dispatch			
	Before	After	
Dates	7/1/07 – 3/3/08	3/4/08 – 6/30/08	7/1/08 – 6/30/09
Call Volume	6,871	3,012	9,363
Average Response Time	4:58	5:29	5:23
Average Dispatch Time (seconds)	11	35	32
Average Travel Time	3:19	3:14	3:33
% of Calls Within 7 Minutes	87.4%	82.2%	84%

**Recommendation:** That the Fire Department continues to monitor the effectiveness of using San Diego Dispatch in regards to meeting the threshold standard.

## 4.0 Appendices

### 4.1 Appendix A – Growth Forecast

### 4.2 Appendix B – Threshold Compliance Questionnaires